UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,473	12/12/2005	Luigi Pichetti	FR920020007US1	3130

50170 7590 11/25/2008

IBM CORP. (WIP)
c/o WALDER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, P.C.
17330 PRESTON ROAD
SUITE 100B
DALLAS, TX 75252

EXAMINER	
BELANI, KISHIN G	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2443	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/560,473	PICHETTI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KISHIN G. BELANI	2443	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 August 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4,6 and 7* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,4,6 and 7* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to Applicants' amendment filed on 08-19-2008. **Claims 1, 4, 6, and 7 have been amended** by the applicants. **Claims 2, 3, 5 and 8-12 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 4, 6 and 7 are now pending** in the present application. The applicants' amendments to the claims are shown in ***bold and italics***, and the examiner's response to the claim amendments is shown in **bold** in this office action. **This Action is made FINAL.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness
   or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Olsen (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0210845 A1)** in view of **Ramakesavan (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,704,770 B1)** and further in view of **Vaha-Sipila et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2001/0054092 A1).**

Consider **claim 1**, Olsen shows and discloses a method of sharing information among at least two data processing entities (**abstract that discloses a method for transferring clipboard data from computer to computer by recognizing that a change has been made to the clipboard of a first computer, notifying at least one second computer of the network that the clipboard data on the first computer has been changed, each second computer then requesting the first computer to paste the data that has been copied to the clipboard of the first computer to a file in an application running on the second computer; paragraphs 0015-0019 disclose the**

same details); the method including the steps of:

receiving a selection of a block of information on a first one of the data processing entities ***for sharing with a second one of the data processing entities*** **(paragraphs 0016-0017 which disclose some data from a software application (such as a Word document) running on a computer being copied to the computer's clipboard in one of a pre-defined formats for sharing with another application running on a different computer; the other computers may also be notified about the formats (indicated by file extensions) in which the data is stored on the updated clipboard of the first computer)**;

receiving a selection that is shared between the first data processing entity and the second data processing entity **(paragraph 0021 which discloses that the method provides a "transparent" mechanism for sharing clipboard data between any number of networked computers without requiring a user to perform any extra action other than issuing a "copy" command (from a "copy" shortcut icon on the toolbar menu) on a first computer and a "paste" command (from a "paste" or "paste remote" shortcut icon on the toolbar menu) on one or more other second computers (i.e. a completely automated method))**;

automatically executing the at least one shortcut command **(paragraph 0021 that discloses automatically executing a "copy" command in response to a user clicking on a "copy" icon from the toolbar after selecting the data that he or she wants stored on the clipboard and shared with other computers)** ***to:***

automatically flush the shared file in response to automatically opening the

shared file **(Fig. 2, step 210 that shows emptying local clipboard contents prior to receiving the selected contents (i.e. after the clipboard file has been opened); paragraph 0053, lines 8-11 disclose the same details),**

automatically insert the selected block of information into the shared file in response to automatically flushing the shared file **(paragraph 0016 which discloses that when data from a software application which is running on a first computer is "copied", it places (inserts) the data on the computer's clipboard; paragraph 0021 which discloses that this operation is performed automatically),**

receiving a selection to operate on the shared file **(paragraph 0021 which further discloses that the method provides a "transparent" mechanism for sharing clipboard data between any number of networked computers without requiring a user to perform any extra action other than issuing a "copy" command (from a "copy" shortcut icon on the toolbar menu) on a first computer and a second "paste" command (from a "paste" or "paste remote" shortcut icon on the toolbar menu) on one or more other second computers (i.e. a completely automated method)); *and***

automatically executing the at least one further shortcut command **(paragraph 0021 that discloses automatically executing a "paste" command in response to a user clicking on a "paste" or "paste remote" icon from the toolbar) *to:***

automatically insert the selected block of information into a clipboard of the second data processing entity in response to automatically opening the shared file **(Fig. 4, step 407; paragraph 0059 which discloses that the data requested by**

the second computer (via issuance of the "paste remote" command) is provided to its operating system, which may temporarily store (automatically insert) the requested data to a clipboard associated therewith), ***and automatically paste the selected block of information from the clipboard into an application running on the second data processing entity*** **(Fig. 4, step 407; paragraph 0059 which discloses that the data requested by the second computer (via issuance of the "paste remote" command) is provided to its operating system, which may "paste" the data as instructed by a program running on the second computer**).

However, Olsen does not show the shortcut icons for "copy" and "paste" or "paste remote" commands (even though it discloses the functions associated with these two icons); furthermore, Olsen also does not specifically disclose receiving a selection of a shortcut icon on the first data processing entity, the shortcut icon being associated with at least one shortcut command to operate on a shared file; to automatically open the shared file in response to receiving the selection of the shortcut icon; to automatically save the shared file in response to automatically inserting the selected block of information; receiving a selection of a second shortcut icon on the second data processing entity, the second shortcut icon being associated with at least one further shortcut command to operate on the shared file; and to automatically open the shared file in response to receiving the selection of the second shortcut icon.

In the same field of endeavor, Ramakesavan shows and discloses the claimed method, including the steps of:

receiving a selection of a shortcut icon on the first data processing entity, the shortcut icon being associated with at least one shortcut command to operate on a shared file that is shared between the first data processing entity and the second data processing entity **(Fig. 2, steps 200 and 205 that show a user selecting a portion of text of a first document stored on a first computer system and then selecting "Copy Export" shortcut icon; Fig. 3 that shows the "Cut Export" (alternate to "Copy Export"), "Copy Export" and "Paste Import" icons under the "Edit" toolbar option; column 3, lines 14-35 describe the same details)**; ***receiving a selection of a second shortcut icon on the second data processing entity, the second shortcut icon being associated with at least one further shortcut command to operate on the shared file*** **(Fig. 2, step 225 that show a user selecting "Paste Import" shortcut icon; Fig. 3 that shows the "Cut Export" (alternate to "Copy Export"), "Copy Export" and "Paste Import" icons under the "Edit" toolbar option; column 3, lines 14-35 describe the same details)**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receive a selection of a shortcut icon on the first data processing entity, the shortcut icon being associated with at least one shortcut command to operate on a shared file that is shared between the first data processing entity and the second data processing entity, and receive a selection of a second shortcut icon on the second data processing entity, the second shortcut icon being associated with at least one further shortcut command to operate on the shared file, as taught by Ramakesavan, in the method of Olsen, so as to automate the transfer of the

selected block of information from a source computer to a destination computer using a shared file.

However, Olsen, as modified by Ramakesavan, does not specifically disclose automatically opening the shared file in response to receiving the selection of the shortcut icon (although a file inherently be opened in order to store or insert data into it); automatically saving the shared file in response to automatically inserting the selected block of information; and automatically opening the shared file in response to receiving the selection of the second shortcut icon (although a file inherently be opened in order to copy data from it).

In the same field of endeavor, Vaha-Sipila et al. disclose ***automatically opening the shared file in response to receiving the selection of the shortcut icon*** **(paragraph 0012, lines 15-17 which disclose that in the destination computer, the shared clipboard file is opened and the desired data is copied to another application, thereby disclosing opening a shared file before processing data in it)**; ***automatically saving the shared file in response to automatically inserting the selected block of information*** **(Fig. 4b; paragraph 0032, lines 14-18 which disclose that when the user copies or cuts 200 some information, the data is stored on a local clipboard 201 and possibly in a shared data file)**; and ***automatically opening the shared file in response to receiving the selection of the second shortcut icon*** **(paragraph 0012, lines 15-17 which disclose that in the destination computer, the shared clipboard file is opened and the desired data is copied to another application)**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to automatically opening the shared file in response to receive the selection of the shortcut icon, automatically save the shared file in response to automatically inserting the selected block of information, and automatically open the shared file in response to receiving the selection of the second shortcut icon, as taught by Vaha-Sipila et al., in the method of Olsen, as modified by Ramakesavan, so as to automate the transfer of the selected block of information from a source computer to a destination computer using a shared file.

Consider **claim 4**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above,** Olsen, as modified by Ramakesavan and Vaha-Sipila et al., further shows and discloses the claimed method wherein the at least one shortcut command ***comprises at least one of a copy shortcut command or a cut shortcut command*** **(in Ramakesavan reference, Fig. 2, steps 200 and 205 that show a user selecting a portion of text of a first document stored on a first computer system and then selecting "Copy Export" shortcut icon; Fig. 3 that shows the "Cut Export" (alternate to "Copy Export"), "Copy Export" and "Paste Import" icons under the "Edit" toolbar option; column 3, lines 14-35 describe the same details)**; ***and***

wherein inserting the block of information in the shared file ***comprises at least one of:***

automatically copying ***the selected block of information into a first clipboard of the first data processing entity in response to the at least one shortcut command***

being a copy shortcut command **(in Olsen reference, paragraph 0021 which discloses that the method provides a "transparent" mechanism for sharing clipboard data between any number of networked computers without requiring a user to perform any extra action other than issuing a "copy" command (from a "copy" shortcut icon on the toolbar menu) on a first computer and a "paste" command (from a "paste" or "paste remote" shortcut icon on the toolbar menu) on one or more other second computers (i.e. a completely automated method))**; or ***automatically*** cutting the ***selected*** block of information into ***the*** first clipboard of the first data processing entity in response to the ***at least one*** shortcut command being a cut shortcut command.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Olsen (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0210845 A1)** in view of **Ramakesavan (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,704,770 B1)** and further in view of **Vaha-Sipila et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2001/0054092 A1)** and further in view of **Bell et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0044723 A1).**

Consider **claim 6**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above,** Olsen, as modified by Ramakesavan and Vaha-Sipila et al., shows and discloses the claimed method, except further ***comprising receiving a selection of*** an extension of the shared file on the first and second data processing entities.

In the same field of endeavor, Bell et al. show and disclose the claimed method, further comprising receiving a selection of an extension of the shared file on the first and second data processing entities (flowchart of Figs. 9A-9B that show a method for sharing media files among a plurality of users; paragraphs 0017, 0033-0034, 0045 describe some of the features of the claimed method; paragraph 0110 further discloses separate drop spots for dragging and dropping user selected media files with different file extensions, such as ".JPG" file-extension associated with DPF (Digital Photo Frame) appliances and image-sharing buddy lists, whereas ".PDF" file-extension types would typically be associated with electronic book appliances and sharing buddy lists, thereby disclosing selecting an extension of the shared file on the first and second data processing entities).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receive a selection of an extension of the shared file on the first and second data processing entities, as taught by Bell et al., in the method of Olsen, as modified by Ramakesavan and Vaha-Sipila et al., so as select appropriate type of media file for transmission to an appliance or sharing with buddies.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Olsen (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0210845 A1)** in view of **Ramakesavan (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,704,770 B1)** and further in view of **Vaha-Sipila et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2001/0054092 A1)** and further in view of **Delo et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,345,386 B1).**

Consider **claim 7**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above,** Olsen, as modified by Ramakesavan and Vaha-Sipila et al., shows and discloses the claimed method, except wherein a predefined one of the data processing entities stores a plurality of shared files assigned to corresponding users, the method further ***comprising*** configuring each data processing entity in response to a log-in of a user to include the at least one shortcut command and the at least one further shortcut command for each shared file assigned to the user.

In the same field of endeavor, Delo et al. show and disclose the claimed method, wherein a predefined one of the data processing entities stores a plurality of shared files assigned to corresponding users (column 2, lines 40-45 which disclose deploying applications (shared files) from a centralized network source, wherein to accomplish advertising, one or more advertising scripts are stored with a policy associated with computer or user policy recipients, and each advertising script includes a product assigned to the policy recipient), the method further comprising:
configuring each data processing entity in response to a log-in of a user to include the at least one shortcut command and the at least one further shortcut command for each shared file assigned to the user (Figs. 7-9; column 2, lines 45-50 which further disclose that when one or more advertising scripts are applied, such as to a user at logon or a machine at reboot, assigned applications are advertised as available to the user, i.e. by placing application shortcuts on a start menu or desktop and by writing entries to the system registry).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store at a predefined one of the data processing entities, a plurality of shared files assigned to corresponding users, and configure each data processing entity in response to a log-in of a user to include the at least one shortcut command and the at least one further shortcut command for each shared file assigned to the user, as taught by Delo et al., in the method of Olsen, as modified by Ramakesavan and Vaha-Sipila et al., so that multiple users can share common applications.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1, 4, 6 and 7** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to** (571) 273-8300 **or mailed to**:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Art Unit: 2443

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Kishin G. Belani whose telephone number is (571) 270-1768. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Tonia Dollinger can be reached on (571) 272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

/K. G. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 2443

November 20, 2008

/Tonia LM Dollinger/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2443